

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BEAUMONT DIVISION

PETER HARRIS and LONI HARRIS,	§	
	§	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>	§	
	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:24-CV-00313
	§	JUDGE MICHAEL J. TRUNCALE
UPWINTRADE.COM, <i>et al.</i> ,	§	
	§	
<i>Defendants.</i>	§	
	§	

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' SECOND  
MOTION FOR EXPEDITED DISCOVERY**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Second Motion for Expedited Discovery. [Dkt. 18]. On August 8, 2024, this Court entered an Order authorizing Plaintiffs to issue subpoenas to various third parties. [Dkt. 7.] Plaintiffs have now received document productions responsive to those subpoenas and gathered additional evidence from other victims of the alleged scam that gave rise to this action. They now seek authorization to issue a second round of subpoenas aiming to discover information about additional John Doe defendants or additional information about the whereabouts, identities, and activities of the defendants they have sued.

Many courts, including this Court, have granted plaintiffs' motions for expedited discovery in cases, like this one, where the plaintiffs alleged that the defendants perpetrated a cryptocurrency-related “pig-butcherling scam.”<sup>1</sup> Here, as in those prior cases, the Plaintiffs have shown that the discovery they seek to issue is narrowly tailored to the task of revealing information they need to effectively pursue

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *Harris v. Upwintrade*, No. 1:24-cv-00313-MJT, Dkt. 8, at p. 9 (authorizing expedited discovery); *Cohn v. Popescu*, No. 1:24-CV-00337-MJT, Dkt. 6, at pp. 8-9 (same); *Strivelli v. Doe*, No. 22-cv-22060, 2022 WL 1082638, at \*2 (D.N.J. Apr. 11, 2022) (authorizing expedited discovery from cryptocurrency exchanges in crypto case and noting “the Court’s review of cryptocurrency theft cases reveals that courts often grant motions for expedited discovery to ascertain the identity of John Doe defendants”); *Licht v. Ling*, No. 3:23-CV-1018-X, 2023 WL 4504585, at \*4 (N.D. Tex. June 20, 2023) (issuing broad authorization for expedited discovery in functionally identical crypto-fraud case and requiring that “any party served with a written request for production shall produce all requested items within 72 hours of the request.”).

their case against “John Doe” defendants who are alleged to have intentionally obscured their true identities and locations.

Accordingly, having reviewed Plaintiffs’ Motion and supporting exhibits, the Court finds that Plaintiffs’ Motion should be **GRANTED**. As requested in their Motion, Plaintiffs are hereby authorized to issue subpoenas to (i) Meta Platforms, Inc., (ii) Microsoft Corporation, (iii) Alphabet, Inc., (iv) T-Mobile USA, Inc., (v) Yahoo! Inc., and (vi) MEXC Global. The subpoena targets shall respond to the Harrises’ subpoenas within fourteen (14) days of the service of same, unless agreement is reached as to a longer response time.

SIGNED this 14th day of January, 2025.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael J. Truncale  
United States District Judge